SecurePART Project

Objective FP7- SEC-2013.7.3.1
Support Action
Increasing the engagement of civil society in security research
Project Number: 608039

D1.2. Background Report

Version 1.0

13 May 2015

1. Change Control

1.1. Document Properties

Deliverable No.		D1.2	
Work Package No	WP1	Work Package Title	Analyse current CSO involvement in FP7
Author/s		Luis Botifoll	
Reviewer		Elizabeth Isaacs	
Name		Background Report	
Date		13 May 2015	
Dissemination Level		PU	

1.2. Revision History

Version	Date	Comments
0.1	21 January 2015	Initial draft
0.2	21 April	Discussed in the Steering Committee ConfCall
0.3	05 May	Final version delivered
1.0	13 May	Approved in the Steering Committee ConfCall, pending formal arrangements

2. Contents

3. Abstract

This document is presenting a summary of the main aspects on CSOs treated mainly in European projects and other European sources about research and, specifically, on security research.

A review of literature and documentation relevant for the issue of civil society organizations involvement in research in a broad sense, including research policy agenda setting, in the field of security have been carried out. The purpose of this review was to gather information about the status-quo and currently followed approaches, major problems and barriers and best practices and lessons learned.

Several sources of information are used to distil key issues for CSOs involvement evaluation according to the roles they can play (policy observers, project evaluators, programme agenda influencers, performers of projects, commissioners of research, disseminators, etc.) but specially according to the usefulness of the approach done by the sources in order to reinforce the role of CSO in the future (by improving their operational capacity, working relationship among CSOs and with the rest of the stakeholders in the European arena).

4. Introduction

This report is not a compilation of the literature produced in security research, European framework programmes and/or civil society organizations involvement. Attention has specifically been paid in those aspects of literature that could help the pursuit of the SecurePART aims, in particular the themes of study in WP3. This is not a comprehensive desk research of all the findings related to CSOs and security research under FP7. This deliverable is the result of the learning from previous reports and documentation about approaches, definitions or models developed.

The report is delivered at the end of WP1 because of the fact that problematic aspects to pay attention were known after the start of activity. Internal discussions within the Consortium, meetings with experts and the advisory board, and the holding of the interviews have facilitated also to focus better the attention.

5. Overview of the participant CSOs

Which are the CSOs that played a role during FP7? It was necessary to have an understanding of the figures, main features, typology, roles of involvement, more active countries, etc. The idea of having a mapping of the participant CSOs was an important point of departure for the SecurePART

analysis.

The SecurePART Consortium analysed 1.935 organisations that have been involved in security research projects during the period 2007-2013[1]. A more detailed analysis of the participants in FP7 projects will be carried out in another deliverable but, at the initial stage, we assessed it was key to essential to feed the project with an overview about participants.

We decided to use the operational definition of CSO established by the European Commission in a preliminary and temporary basis.[2]. According to this definition, we have identified that only a few part of the participants: 93 organisations can be considered civil society ones, a 4,8% of the total. More than the absolute number, we consider it is more relevant the percentage of CSOs in relation to the overall participants.

Type of involvement

There is only 1 CSO that have played the role of 'coordinator' in a security research project. The remaining 92 have been only 'participants' in transnational consortia. The number of projects in which the 93 CSOs have been involved is 129. The involvement of two organizations stands above the rest: *Fondation pour la Recherche Stratégique* in France with 6 projects and *Magen David Adom* in Israel with 7 projects. It is also to be pointed out the high participation of the Red Cross movement (10 different organizations in 22 projects).

The problem of hybridity

However, further analysis revealed some problems to the initial quantification. These organisations have not a similar profile as actors of the civil society. A part of them respond to what can be considered as having '**genuine**' features as CSOs, some others can just be considered as **hybrid** ones, with mixed features with other type of organizations and, finally, a third group of **undefined** organizations needing further conceptual definition.[3] There were some reports[4] analyzing the typology of CSO but we found insufficient. A list of the identified CSOs can be found in Annex I of this report.

According to the characterization carried out by the SecurePART, CSOs with a genuine profile have been 39 (2,0%), CSOs with an hybrid profile have been 28 (1,4%) and undefined are 26 (1,3%). The problem of hybrid CSOs derives from the mixture of the elements; they are in part CSOs but they are in part governmental, research centres, etc. for these cases a centre of gravity should be

---

[1] Open-data repository of the EU, and contains only partial information of FP7-SEC projects from 2007-2013. https://open-data.europa.eu/en/data/dataset/cordisfp7projects

[2] This operation definition is presented in D3.1 and D3.2.

[3] In a case study of D1.6 (Split personality CSOs) attention has been put to isolate the 'civil societiliness' elements of a CSO; also in WP3 and WP5 this activity will be continued.

[4] Especially, Fabrice DESSE: The Role and Structure of Civil Society Organizations in National and Global Governance Evolution and outlook between now and 2030. Project AUGUR, 2012.

established. The problem of undefined CSOs depend on the restrictiveness of the definition used and how to evaluate some specific cases (for instance, business associations that are composed only by companies).

Country	Total participants analysed	Core CSOs	% Core CSOs	Hybrid CSOs	% Hybrid CSOs	Undefined CSOs	% Undef. CSOs
Belgium	85	4	4,7	4	4,7	12	14,1
France	170	6	3,5	5	2,9	4	2,4
Netherlands	114	7	6,1	2	1,8	1	0,9
UK	210	4	1,9	3	1,4	1	0,5
Germany	183	3	1,6	2	1,1	0	0,0
Luxembourg	14	2	14,3	1	7,1	1	7,1
Denmark	31	1	3,2	2	6,5	1	3,2
Austria	60	2	3,3	0	0,0	1	1,7
Norway	44	1	2,3	1	2,3	0	0,0
Israel	40	2	5,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Spain	160	1	0,6	1	0,6	1	0,6
Hungary	23	1	4,3	1	4,3	0	0,0
Bulgaria	15	3	20,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Turkey	15	1	6,7	1	6,7	1	6,7
Tunisia	1	1	100,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Switzerland	46	0	0,0	1	2,2	0	0,0
Greece	63	0	0,0	1	1,6	0	0,0
Finland	43	0	0,0	1	2,3	0	0,0
Italy	168	0	0,0	1	0,6	2	1,2
Sweden	51	0	0,0	1	2,0	1	2,0
Other countries	399	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Total	**1935**	**39**	**2,0**	**28**	**1,4**	**26**	**1,3**

Table 1: Distribution per countries: number of core and hybrid CSOs and %

Paying attention to a distribution per countries, it is dominant a presence of those from West Europe; specially Belgium, France and Netherlands. In the case of Belgium it is to be noted that a significant part of the CSOs have a European, and not a national/subnational, coverage.

The problem of undefinition
It is usually deduced from literature the difficulty of defining and approaching CSOs in Europe. The concept of CSOs is often ambiguous. As this fact may either hinder or be relevant for the way of involvement and cooperation, it is usual to tackle the notion in literature. Suprisingly the casuistry is related is too high and we have not found that the different hypotheses of CSO cases are covered.

Need of characterization
We identified a set of hybrid and undefined cases of organisations that needed further

characterization activity. In this way, we identified the following groups of CSOs:

- Business associations, especially in the sector of transport but not exclusively, composed by companies;
- Professional associations that bring together practitioners of an activity in which membership is not compulsory and/or access is open to other persons or groups;
- Professional bodies where the organization has an official mandate to protect or regulate the conditions for the exercise of a profession;
- Think-tanks, that are difficult to distinguish both from academic societies and social policy research societies, which are more or less devoted to open citizenship-oriented activities;
- Social economy companies that are non-profit oriented and have a public interest mission;
- Intermediary non for profit 'facilitator' organisations that are specialised in public relations and events;
- Research centres that are led by CSOs;
- Public bodies that have a very flexible link with the Administration;
- Academic societies with open educational and research mission and members.

In all these cases we perceive at this stage that further clarification effort is needed that is proposed to be undertaken along the SecurePART. Especially, this mapping of the European landscape of CSOs will led to a characterization of the elements that constitute a CSO (topic developed in a case study of D1.6), a system to measure the presence of what we called 'civil socialiteness' in D3.2 and further activities in WP5.

The clustering of CSOs

All CSOs, irrespective of their consideration as genuine, hybrids or undefined, can be included in a thematic clustering. In SecurePART we have identified the following list: emergency services (first aid & rescue services, etc.); medical associations; community integration associations; science and technology dissemination associations; dialogue and participation associations; human rights associations; ICT Security organizations; transport associations; climate change and environmental organizations; development and cooperation organizations; policy think tanks; law societies.

Also, additionally, some of them can be included in a transversal clustering:

- Stakeholders associations that bring together different types of actors (mostly industry, public administration and researchers);
- Second level CSOs and other types of associations (federation of organisations of smaller level).

This clustering of CSOs can be useful to obtain a map of CSOs according to their level of participation in FP7 and the national variation appreciated.

6. Overview of the literature review conducted

Summarising the review results, it is noted that the amount of literature on CSO involvement in research processes in the field of security is rather limited. There are several publications dealing either with the issue of CSO Involvement in R&D processes in other sectors than security. However, it is considerably difficult to find documents focusing on the role and contribution of civil society actors on security research and on how to enhance it. It is to be remarked that documents and reports do hardly deal with the involvement of CSOs in research or in security research in particular. Thus, it seems rather difficult to derive approaches, regulations, good practices and working models from the literature reviewed. Whereas some of the reviewed documents briefly address the issue and confirm the importance of further including civil society knowledge, know-how and experience into research processes in general, only a few provide information, ideas or suggestions about how and through which approaches this should take place, or whether and how this should be supported.

Whereas there are endless publications on all different aspects of security research, the issue of CSO involvement particularly is rarely the subject addressed. This may lead us to the conclusion that the improvement of CSO involvement is an under-investigated issue. Recommendations and guidelines are difficult to find.

At the same time however, the subject of CSO involvement in general has not become more popular within the last years during FP7 execution. A significant attention paid to the role of CSOs was already deployed in FP6.

All relevant literature reviewed was stored in a particular file and the list is provided in Annex II of this deliverable, including a small description and the reasons that further consideration is required.

7. Topics of interest identified

The analysis of literature enabled to perfom the following assessment. Under the following subsections, we have tried to identify some relevant topics to be taken into account by the SecurePART project team.

7.1. Need of transferability

The review activities have shown that literature addressing the issue of CSO involvement in security research is rather scarce. While some of the reports dealt with CSO participation in a more general way or in other fields and areas, it was particularly difficult to find information on

the scrutinised field. Therefore, in the selection of reviewed reports, a wider approach has been chosen, by keeping in mind to question the transferability. For this reason, it has been considered as recommendable to explore CSO involvement in general aspects and in other research fields and to assess and evaluate in a comparative manner the ways and approaches used here in view of enhancing multi-stakeholder cooperation. Analysing CSO involvement in general fields and other research themes will be helpful for comparative studies. The deliverables of the CONSIDER and PERARES projects fall under this need of transferability, also some official reports issued from the European Commission and from national states. Approaches and experiences mentioned in these documents were hence analysed in view of their transferability.

7.2. Practicality

Information on already existing and applied forms and approaches of CSO participation in research was rather poor. It was not difficult to obtain theoretical and more general explanations about CSO involvement practices and approaches. However, It was considerable difficult to find discussions or analyses of the way specific CSOs are interacting and cooperating with other R&D stakeholders and with other CSOs. If the issue of CSO involvement was addressed, the approaches, supportive settings and arrangements were not really exposed and could mainly only be deduced from the specific examples given. If practical examples are rarely provided, they can mainly be found in other research fields than security.

7.3. Orientation to action

Concerning engagement in research, several reports focus on the role played by public institutions and private sector organisations, but do not mention how CSOs can be an active partner. In a general way, the importance of CSO involvement in research is acknowledged in several of the analysed reports and projects. The importance of cooperating with the civil society in a general way is widely acknowledged in many studies. However, the question about how to promote, encourage and improve the CSOs internally, and the cooperation with the rest of CSOs and the rest of stakeholders is not sufficiently addressed and answered. In return, publications highlight major problems and barriers, such as the lack of funding that could support and ease such cooperation, or the weak institutional structure and insufficient organisation of civil society organisations and the civil society community.

For this orientation to action, guides, handbooks and other tools in particular from the STACS project (*Civil Society Organisations, actors in the European system of research and innovation*) or RAPID (*Research and Policy in Development*) will be very useful especially regarding the activities to undertake in WP4.

7.4. Top down CSOs

There is an idyllic view of CSOs that are grassroot-oriented, express a citizen point of view and ensure a connection between the researcher and industry communities with the society at large. However the reality of CSOs in the security research area is more complex. There is an increasing number of professionalized, in some way "technocratic", CSOs that are very specialized and consultant-and influencer oriented, etc.

Below a preliminary list of some 'top-down' CSOs that develop an activity at European level:

Name of the CSO	Self-attributed features
Crisis Management Initiative	The Crisis Management Initiative (CMI) is "an independent, non-profit organisation that innovatively promotes and works for sustainable security. CMI works to strengthen the capacity of the international community in comprehensive crisis management and conflict resolution. CMI's work builds on wide stakeholder networks. It combines analysis, action and advocacy". This organization was set-up by the ex-Finnish prime minister, Martti Ahtisaari. The European Commission included this organization as a CSO representative at the European Security Research Advisory Board and was represented at the ESRIF.
Institute for Security Studies	The European Commission included this organization as a CSO representative at the European Security Research Advisory Board and nominated as part of the Group of Personalities in 2004 that prepared the report "Research for a Secure Europe". This CSO has been funded by the EU in some occasions.
Istituto Affari Internazionali	The European Commission included this organization as a CSO representative at the European Security Research Advisory Board.
European Institute for Risk, Security and Communication Management (EURISC)	This organisation was represented at the European Security Research and Innovation Forum' (ESRIF)[5] created in 2007.
European Corporate Security Association,	This organisation was represented at the European Security Research and Innovation Forum' ESRIF) created in 2007.
Security & Defence Agenda	The Security & Defence Agenda (SDA) is a Brussels' only dedicated security and defence think-tank. Its activities include debates, international conferences and a range of publications.[1] It is located at 4 Rue de la Science, Brussels with its sister think tank, Friends of Europe.

Table 1: Examples of 'top-down' CSOs

The list of CSOs above have not played a direct and specific role in security research under FP7, or only in a marginal way, however their influence was very important. They intervened in very

---

[5] ESRIF: informal and voluntary group of experts coming from both the demand and the supply side of security technologies and solutions as well as from societal organizations.

specific target actions, providing high level expertise. This problem is close to the issue of hybridity, however we consider that specific attention can be paid to the emergence and consolidation of this type of CSOs at the European arena.

7.5. The framing of the stakeholders: end users

The German Security Research Programme conceives as stakeholders: industry, researchers, academia, etc. but CSOs are not included in a similar way. They are conceived as "end-users". According to the German Security Research Programme it is expected that "end users" will reflect on the needs of the civil society. The understanding of end-users as an specific type of stakeholder is as follows: "End user: Private & public bodies, including infrastructure operators, first-responders, police forces etc." According to this understanding, some CSOs (e.g. Red Cross) or at least some of their specific activities developed by CSOs can be splitted. Part of their role cannot take place specifically as end-user and be reduced their involvement to issues of interoperability, norms and standards. CSOs can play for instance a role of researchers or they can disseminate technology results and contribute to provide societal acceptance.

7.6. CSOs are not the subject

In the analysis of projects documentation, it is commonly appreciated that the target group to whom reports and analysis are addressed are often not directly CSOs. Most of the activity seems to have different governmental bodies and this activity developed in European projects and advisory boards of different institutions. It is not specially expected from them a reaction: they are the target group, the object –not the subject- of the social policy research, in some way a protected target, but they are not the addressee of the deliverable, or the target for actions and recommendations. The need to increase societal engagement and involvement of civil society organizations is discussed usually with no special role from them.

7.7. Involvement of CSOs in security research goes beyond strict FP7 participation

Different cases are identified at European level as containing useful elements or approaches done by CSOs in security research but beyond the strict framework of participation in FP7. Some examples:

Campaign against Israeli participation in security research projects - Bottom-up and very focused campaigns devoted to express "the regret to the EU funded partnership" with Israelian companies such as Ahava or the Israel Aerospace Industries Ltd and committed to "exclude Israel's defence and security industry from future partnerships" in collaborative projects. These campaign are organized by Palestinian solidarity groups and the National Union of Students from UK and

university groups from Belgium, among others. Ahava has been involved in a NMP project with indirect security concerns called NANORETOX (*The reactivity and toxicity of engineered nanoparticles: risks to the environment and human health*). IAI has been involved in five FP7 projects in the aerospace field, with an indirect impact on security, but they are not specifically framed within security research. However the connection with the security research policy is emphasized by the campaigners: "*It is clear that without changes to the status quo, things will get a lot worse (or better if you happen to be an Israeli security contractor). First, the security research budget is set to grow from €1.4 billion in FP7 to as much as €4.1 billion under Horizon 2020*"(...) "*there is a tangible culture of cooperation between the European and Israeli security research elite, with the former assuming that participation of the latter enhances their funding prospects*" reported Statewatch.

European Cyber Security Month (ECSM) - The ECSM is a European Union advocacy campaign that takes place in October aimed at promoting cyber security among citizens, to change their perception of cyber-threats and provide up to date security information, through education and sharing good practices. This initiative is launched and coordinated by the European Union Agency for Network and Information Security (ENISA) in 2014 and is devoted to involve private and public sector stakeholders. The type of the activities to be carried out are at the core of many CSOs, however in this case awareness raising is directly promoted by a public agency, substituting in a certain way the role of civil society and where CSOs are just playing a secondary accompanying role.

Collaborative activism - Example of bilateral collaboration between two CSOS, the UK's based Statewatch and the Dutch Transnational Institute (TNI) in the preparation and publication of a report called "EURODRONES Inc." addressed to the EU's security and R&D policy in the technology field of drones. This report is in the basis of an advocacy campaign led by the same organizations. Collaboration between these two organisations is focused; in the past, they have prepared together other similar initiatives.

7.8. The role played by CSOs in FP7

In literature a lot of attention is paid to innovative participatory methods such as social dialogue initiatives conducting to a more engaged society at large in science and technology issues. However, these descriptions, such as the inventory done within the Engage 2020 project, have no direct relationship with the effective activity played by CSOs. Analysing project websites and the role carried out by CSOs in them, it does not seem exist an innovative role proposed to CSOs. As these participatory methods could increase societal knowledge, ideas and capacities in research and increasing the knowledge base for policy making, CSOs should take care of them. They are usually playing a more conventional role as advisors, end users or disseminators in unidirectional

activities. It would be interesting in knowing more in detail these participatory methods and which organizations are doing a more extensive use of these innovative methods.

In parallel, it is important to analyse in more detail which is the role played by CSOs. According to the initial mapping under FP7, we see that CSOs are overwhelming reactive and they do not act as promoter or coordinator of projects. However, more detail is needed in order to assess the effectiveness of 'mainstreaming' instruments vs. specific schemes targeted to CSOs (as it took place under FP7 but not specifically in security research). A comparative analysis of the funding scheme Research for the benefit of specific groups BSG – CSO and the general instruments seems to be relevant.

Annex I – List of CSOs involved in security research under FP7

Below the list of the 39 CSOs that have been identified as 'genuine' ones:

Name	Country
E-FORUM FORUM FOR EUROPEAN E-PUBLICSERVICES AISBL	BE
TECHNOLOGIES SANS FRONTIERES ASBL	BE
CENTRE FOR LIBERAL STRATEGIES	BG
GERMAN EUROPEAN SECURITY ASSOCIATION EV	DE
DEUTSCHES ROTES KREUZ LANDESVERBANDSACHSEN EV	DE
LAW AND INTERNET FOUNDATION	BG
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRACY	BG
DANSK RODE KORS (DANISH RED CROSS)	DK
CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION	ES
ASSOCIATION PEGASE	FR
COMITE CONTRE L'ESCLAVAGE MODERNE	FR
CENTRE DETUDES SUR LES CONFLITS	FR
MAGYAR VOROSKERESZT TARSADALMI SZERVEZET	HU
AMUTA LE YELADIM BESIKUN	IL
AIDE INTERNATIONALE DE LA CROIX-ROUGE LUXEMBOURGEOISE ASBL	LU
GROUPE DE SUPPORT PSYCOLOGIQUE ASBL	LU
ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN VERENIGING	NL
STICHTING PRACTICA	NL
STICHTING IMPACT, LANDELIJK KENNIS EN ADVIESCENTRUM PSYCHOS.	NL
THE INTERNATIONAL LA STRADA ASSOCIATION	NL
STICHTING VOOR INTERCULTURELE PARTICIPATIE EN INTEGRATIE	NL
STIFTELSEN FLYKTNINGERADET	NO
ASSOCIATION FORUM DES SCIENCES SOCIALES APPLIQUEES	TN
TURKIYE KIZILAY DERNEGI	TR
THE STEPHEN LAWRENCE CHARITABLE TRUST	UK
RADICAL MIDDLE WAY COMMUNITY INTEREST COMPANY	UK
THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	UK
THE BRITISH RED CROSS SOCIETY ROYAL CHARTER	UK
OSTERREICHISCHES ROTES KREUZ	AT
FORSCHUNGSINSTITUT DES ROTEN KREUZES	AT
INTERNATIONAL FORUM FOR BIOPHILOSOPHY	BE
EUROPEAN EMERGENCY NUMBER ASSOCIATION ASBL	BE
HAUT COMITE FRANCAIS DEFENSE CIVILE	FR
ORT FRANCE	FR
HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS	NL
VERENIGING VOOR CHRISTELIJK HOGER ONDERWIJS WETENSCHAPPELIJK	NL
DEUTSCHES ROTES KREUZ EV	DE
FONDATION POUR LA RECHERCHE STRATEGIQUE	FR
MAGEN DAVID ADOM IN ISRAEL	IL

Table 2: The 'core' CSOs

Hybrid CSOs

The following 28 organisations have been considered hybrid civil society ones, in spite of the fact that they have a mixed features with other types of stakeholders. We have analysed case by case their inclusion into this category.

Name	Country
EUROSINT FORUM ASBL	BE
AGE PLATFORM EUROPE AISBL	BE
EUROPEAN NETWORK OF NATIONAL CIVIL SOCIETY ASSOCIATIONS	BE
EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF TRANSPORT USERS	BE
FONDEN TEKNOLOGIR??DET	DK
IFRC REFERENCE CENTRE FOR PSYCHOSOCIAL SUPPORT C/O DANISH RED CROSS	DK
SECCION ESPAGNOLA DE LA ASOCIACION EUROPEA DE FERROVIARIOS	ES
CRISIS MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE	FI
FORUM EUROPEEN POUR LA SECURITE URBAINE	FR
POLE EUROMEDITERRANEEN SUR LES RISQUES ASSOCIATION	FR
EUROPEAN MATERIALS RESEARCH SOCIETY	FR
SOCIETE FRANCAISE DE MEDICINE DE CATASTROPHE	FR
REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER FOR CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE -REC	HU
GLOBAL CYBER SECURITY CENTER	IT
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT-ROUGE - SHELTER RESEARCH UNIT	LU
EUROPEAN NETWORK FOR CYBER SECURITY COOPERATIEF UA	NL
EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICY MANAGEMENT	NL
FORSKNINGSSTIFTELSEN FAFO	NO
IDEELLA FORENINGAR UTRIKESPOLITISKAINSTITUTET, INFORMATIONSAVD	SE
ANKARA STRATEJI ENSTITUSU DERNEGI	TR
TAVISTOCK INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RELATIONS LBG	UK
DISASTER WASTE RECOVERY LBG	UK
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR STRATEGIC STUDIES (IISS)	UK
FOUNDATION - GLOBAL RISK FORUM GRF DAVOS STIFTUNG	CH
ELLINIKI OMADA DIASOSIS SOMATEIO	EL
POLE PILOTE DE SECURITE LOCALE - PPSL	FR

Table 3: the hybrid CSOs

Undefined CSOs

The following 26 organisations have been considered civil society ones, in spite of the fact that a further definition activity has to be done. We have analysed case by case their provisory inclusion into this category.

Name	Country
OESTERREICHISCHE STUDIENGESELLSCHAFT FUER KYBERNETIK	AT
GS1 AISBL	BE
WASTE OF ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONICAL EQUIPMENT FORUM AISBL	BE
IRU PROJECTS ASBL	BE
EUROPEAN INTERMODAL ASSOCIATION	BE
AEROSPACE AND DEFENCE INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION OF EUROPE	BE
UNION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE TRANSPORT COMBINE RAIL ROUTE	BE
INTERNATIONAL CONTAINER SECURITY ORGANISATION	BE
UNION INTERNATIONALE DES TRANSPORTS PUBLICS - UITP	BE
EUROPAISCHER AUSSCHUSS FUR RECHTSMEDIZIN EV	DE
EUROPEAN RADIATION DOSIMETRY GROUP E.V.	DE
DANSK BRAND- OG SIKRINGSTEKNISK INSTITUT FORENING	DK
ASOCIACION DE EMPRESAS DE ELECTRONICA, TECNOLOGIAS DE LA INFORMACION Y TELECOMUNICACIONES DE ESPANA	ES
OBSERVATOIRE MEDITERRANEEN DE L'ENERGIE	FR
BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DES CONTAINERS ET DU TRANSPORT INTERMODAL	FR
CENTRO EURO-MEDITERRANEO SUI CAMBIAMENTI CLIMATICI SCARL	IT
UNINFO - ASSOCIAZIONE DI NORMAZIONE INFORMATICA	IT
FEDERATION OF EUROPEAN UNION FIRE OFFICER ASSOCIATIONS	LU
AMBULANCEZORG NEDERLAND	NL
SECURITY ASSOCIATION FOR THE MARITIME INDUSTRY LIMITED	UK
CONFEDERATION OF ORGANISATIONS IN ROAD TRANSPORT ENFORCEMENT AISBL	BE
Clecat - European Association for Forwarding, Transport, Logistics and Customs Service	BE
UNION DES INDUSTRIES FERROVIAIRES EUROPEENNES - UNIFE	BE
ASSOCIATION COMITE NATIONAL FRANCAIS DU CTIF (COMITE TECHNIQUE INTERNATIONAL DE PREVENTION ET D EXTINCTION DU FEU)	FR
STORSTOCKHOLMS BRANDFORSVAR	SE
AMBULANCE AND EMERGENCY PHYSICIANS ASSOCIATION	TR
UNION INTERNATIONALE DES CHEMINS DE FER	FR
EUROPEAN ORGANISATION FOR SECURITY SCRL	BE

Table 4: the undefined CSOs

Annex II – List of literature analysed

The following documents have been identified as having a particular interest to the project aims have been analysed and proposed to different task leaders for their respective work.

Title, author	Short description	SecurePart areas of interest
Bridging the gaps: Citizens, organisations and dissociation. Civil Society Index summary report: 2008-2011. CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg, 2011	Report encouraging civil society organizations self reflection and analysis to conduct self-assessments on an array of key indicators which build up a picture of the strength of and constraints against civil society in five key areas: civic engagement; level of organisation; practice of values; perception of impact; and the external environment.	Introductory purpose, mainly on CSO networking and with the rest of private stakeholders. Horizontal approach non specialised in research and/or security.
Final Study Report. Organised civil society and European governance. CIVGOV project 2006	The report contains information about the role of CSOs in research under FP5 and their policy implications, mainly accountability and representativeness.	Introductory purpose. Horizontal approach non specialised in security research.
Glossary. Civil society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012	Concept or notion definitions about CSOs scope, power and research projects.	Useful in order to use harmonized concepts in all different WPs.
WP1		
Public Oversight of the Security Sector. A Handbook for Civil Society Organizations. United Nations Development Programme, 2008	Handbook on strategies and methodologies followed by CSOs in security issues. How CSOs do desk research and provide information, . raise awareness, advocates, train, monitor and analyse policy and budget developments, build organizational credibility. Challenges and opportunities of CSOs are also presented.	Classification of the activity carried out by CSOs in security research. Horizontal approach non specialised in Europe and in research and/or security. Potential use in WP1, case study on CSO selection.
Survey report. (D2.2) Civil society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012	Survey addressed to develop an understanding of the pertinent aspects of CSOs participation and plays a part in the identification of CSOs engagement rules and patterns in research	Useful for the design of the web survey - task 1.3.
The Role and Structure of Civil Society Organizations in National and Global Governance Evolution and outlook between now and	The report defined three main criteria to evaluate CSOs' power: the capacity, the sustainability and the impact of CSOs. Also, the power and structure of	Very interesting in all WP1-WP3 activities, especially regarding CSO definition and cultural attitudes regarding

2030. Fabrice Desse. Project AUGUR, 2012.	CSOs at a global level is studied.	CSOs.
WP2		
Science and Society, Time for a new Deal. An integral part of European Research and Innovation policy. Robert-Jan Smits. Berlaymont Paper No. 3.BEPA 2013,	Report trying to align science, innovation and society for an informed, sustainable and inclusive knowledge society.	Case studies. Problem of acceptance and acceptability. WP1 case study and WP3.
Report on Participation of Civil Society Organisations in Research. Civil Society Organisations, actors in the European system of research and innovation (STACS, FP7 project). 2010	The report analyses the benefits and difficulties of two innovative mechanisms that allow and fund research partnerships between scientists and CSOs. The reports contain the presentations of these funding mechanisms, examples of projects, barriers, keys to CSO involvement in research and recommendation to the rest of stakeholders..	Experiences and recommendations of interest for intra-CSO and inter-CSO relations improvement. Potential use in WP3.
Handbook for CSOs on Understanding the European research system. Civil Society Organisations, actors in the European system of research and innovation (STACS, FP7 project). 2010	Handbook to support the information gap, and at giving tools to CSOs to get involved in research and research policy at the European level.	Experiences and recommendations of interest for intra-CSO and inter-CSO relations improvement. Potential use in WP3.
Final report FP7 Project Science, technology and civil society - Civil Society Organisations, actors in the European system of research and innovation (STACS, FP7 project). 2010	Conclusions of the reflection on and an analysis of existing experiences and policies, and policy recommendations for the involvement of CSOs with other stakeholders in scientific issues in general.	Potential use in WP3. Experiences and recommendations of interest for intra-CSO and inter-CSO relations improvement.
Theoretical Landscape. (D1.2). Civil society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012	Theoretical reflection given to the question of why CSOs are sought to be involved in research processes. Attention is paid to concepts such as legitimacy, effectiveness, accountability, deliberation, aggregation, participation, discussion, consultation, deliberation, etc.	In WP3, approach to the range of potential CSO roles and expectations.
Governance Models (D1.4).Civil society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012	The report enables the development of governance models for CSOs involved in research which are tested and / or exemplified by case studies.	Potentially useful for WP3 when establishing the check-list for CSOs.
Methodology Definition and Observation Tools. (D2.1) Civil	Empirical analysis of practices of CSO participation in research projects	Useful for WP3.

society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012		
Analytical Grid. (D1.3) Civil society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012	The report presents an analytical grid that permits a principled study of relevant cases and grounds tools of assessment that can inform policy design	Useful for WP3. The report presents how do CSOs to define and reach their expectations related to defining public interest when constructing positions in research projects.
Main Findings Report (D2.3). Civil society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012	Results of the reframing of the research governance main typologies in order to be able to describe and understand new collaboration practices, questioning how public interest could be best taken into account.	Useful for WP3. Preliminary aspects.
Framework for the Comparison of Theories and CSO Participation in Research Governance (D3.1). Civil society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012	This report provides the conceptual basis for the development of the model to be undertaken	Useful for WP3. Preliminary aspects.
Report on the Analysis of Governance Theory and the Practice of Participation of CSOs in Research Governance. (D3.2). Civil society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012	Assessment and diagnostic tool that allows to detect limits, gaps and blind spots in current CSO practices and relate them to model building. This report bases a ground for recommendations and policy guidelines.	Useful for WP3. Preliminary aspects.
Model of CSO Participation in Research Governance. (D3.3) Civil society organisations in designing research governance (CONSIDER). 2012	The model presents two variables: social interaction (the authority a CSO has in a research project) and the importance of the CSO for knowledge production (level of influence of the CSO on the construction of knowledge within a project).	Useful for WP3. Preliminary aspects.
The role of Civil Society Organisations in regulating business. Bridget M. Hutter & Joan O'Mahony. ESCR – Centre for Analysis of Risk and Regulation. LSE. September 2004.	The report presents the role and the potential of CSOs in government regulatory agendas. The report is neither focused on research policy nor European level.	Useful for WP3. Preliminary aspects. In particular related to the criteria used to measure representativeness of CSOs.
Civil society as a system. André Reichel, in a Civil Society for Sustainability. A guidebook for connecting science and society. Bremen, 2012. CSS "Civil Society for Sustainability" project.	The role of civil society organisations may play a vital role as reminders of the values of a society (raise sensitivity, communication).	Useful in order to define the roles to be played by CSOs (WP3).

Sicherheitsforschung - Begriffsfassung und Vorgangsweise für Österreich. BIEBER Ronald and others. 2005	Safety/security research topics are suggested for the Austrian national programme.	Interesting to analyse the dichotomy between mainstreaming vs specific CSO funding schemes. Potential interest in WP3, task 3.2 & 3.3
Research for a safer society – New knowledge for future challenges. MSB's research strategy. Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)	Topics of interest for the Swedish national programme of security.	Interesting to analyse the dichotomy between mainstreaming vs specific CSO funding schemes. Potential interest in WP3, task 3.2 & 3.3
D3.2 Public Engagement Methods and Tools. Engage2020 Tools and instruments for a better societal engagement in "Horizon 2020". Applied Research and Communications Fund (ARC Fund). 2014	Mapping of engagement methods and tools. It is an inventory based in factsheets.	This inventory of participatory methods can be useful in. Potential interest in WP3, task 3.2 & 3.3
D8.1. Experiences and attitudes of Research Funding Organisations towards public engagement with research with and for civil society and its organizations. Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society – PERARES Norbert Steinhaus, and others, 2013	Report analyzing different experiences of incorporating the needs of CSOs in research funding in the different European countries.	Interesting in order to assess how CSOs are taken into consideration in the different countries. Potential interest in WP3, task 3.2 & 3.3
Bases of Power and Effective Participation of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in Development Partnerships. The Need for Governance? Dr. Annekathrin Ellersiek, , in a Civil Society for Sustainability. A guidebook for connecting science and society. Bremen, 2012. CSS "Civil Society for Sustainability" project.	Added-value of a systematic inclusion of partnership-specific relational influences	Useful for WP3 tasks 3.2 and 3.3.
Multi-stakeholder initiatives A strategic guide for civil society organizations. Mariëtte van Huijstee. SOMO- Centre for Research on Multinational Corporations. Amsterdam. 2012	A guide for CSOs involved in multi-stakeholders initiatives, in spite of the fact the guide is not focused on research issues. This guide is intended for professionals working for CSOs and participating in MSIs.	Useful for WP3 tasks 3.2 and 3.3.
Towards a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue -	Principles and demanding minimum standards for consultation of	WP3, task 3.3

General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission. European Commission Brussels, COM(2002) 704 final, 2002.	stakeholders and acknowledging that degree and quality of participation have an impact on the quality of policies	
Goverscience: Civil Society Organizations Seminar. European Commission. Brussels, 2009.	knowledge production in research actions closer to citizens' needs and concerns, and initiate policy change. Recommendations	Potential interest as introduction in task 3.1
Ethical and Regulatory Challenges to Science and Research Policy at the Global Level. European Commission, 2012	Presentation of mechanisms for the governance of science and innovation.	Potential interest as introduction in task 3.1
Interim evaluation & assessment of future options for Science in Society Actions. Technopolis and Fraunhofer, 2012	Interim Evaluation of the FP7 Science in Society (SiS) programme that takes into consideration some elements related to CSOs.	For a sound analysis of trans-CSO analysis: involvement with other stakeholders. WP3
D2.3. Sector survey meetings and report Virtual centre of excellence for research support and coordination on societal security. SOURCE Consortium. SOURCE 2014	Summary of the sector survey meeting that was organised by the SOURCE Network on the 5th of June 2014 in Brussels.	For trans-CSO analysis: involvement with other stakeholders. WP3
D2.4. Overview and analysis of modes of exchange between relevant sectors. SOURCE Consortium. SOURCE 2014	This report pursued the objective to describe the modes of interactions of the different sectors concerned with societal security and to detect the obstacles which could hinder a successful interaction and cooperation of all sectors to enhance societal security in Europe.	For trans-CSO analysis: involvement with other stakeholders. WP3
WP4		
Why and how to participate in the European Research and Innovation Framework Programme Horizon 2020? Manual for civil society organizations. Fondation Sciences Citoyennes. 2014	A guide for CSOs on H2020	Interesting for the communication materials to be produced under task 4.2
Pamphlet on "Citizen scientists - reconnecting science with society". Civil Society Organisations, actors in the European system of research and innovation (STACS, FP7 project).	Presenting five examples, the pamphlet support the expansion of initiatives based on the "citizen scientist" role.	Potential use in WP4, especially the writing of the guide about how to communicate with CSO Potential use in WP4.

2010		
Successful Communication. A Toolkit for Researchers and Civil Society Organisations. A Toolkit for Researchers and Civil Society Organisations. Hovland, I.: RAPID (Research and Policy in Development) 2005	Toolkit for researchers and practitioners who wish to communicate to policymakers. The tools are therefore specifically geared towards the needs of researchers and practitioners in civil society organisations (CSOs),	Interesting for the communication materials to be produced under task 4.2
D 8: Understanding the European Research System. A Handbook for Civil Society OrganisationsHandbook for CSOs on European research Éric Gall, Claudia Neubauer, Glen Millot & Fabien Piasecki Science, technology and civil society - Civil Society Organisations, actors in the European system of research and innovation – STACS. Fondation Sciences Citoyennes 2008.	Report analysing the role for civil society in EU research choices: what is participatory research; European experiences and opportunities; key principles and recommendations; need to increase the dialogue between "Science and Society"	Interesting for the communication materials to be produced under task 4.2

www.securepart.eu

bantec group
www.bantec.es

vdlconsult . . . . .
www.vdlconsult.de

enna
www.enna-europe.org

nexus
www.nexusinstitut.de

GOETHE UNIVERSITÄT FRANKFURT AM MAIN
www.uni-frankfurt.de

University of Salford MANCHESTER
www.salford.ac.uk

LOBA
www.loba.pt